



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of the Strait of Belle Isle, and facing the Labrador Coast, which is distinctly visible from here; being only about nine miles distant. This path is called "Chemin de Sauvage." There is also a place on the same shore called Savage Cove, which is probably the supposed place of their departure. This would seem to bear out the statement of the Micmacs. Again, in the English Coast Pilot for 1755, there is a place near Hawkes' Bay or Point Riche, called "Passage de Savages."

It is only fair to the future ethnologist to point out that while we have no definite reason to suppose that descendants of the Beothuk do actually exist anywhere now, there is, nevertheless, a strong force of opinion to render this an affirmative possibility. There is still a hope that a source of information on culture may be found. The ethnology of the interior of Labrador, especially that of the eastern section, is practically unknown and it would be very unsafe to say at this time what sub-types of north-eastern culture and dialects might not be found there.

Whether or not the hope of learning more of the culture of the supposedly extinct tribe is ever realized there is a grave doubt if Mr. Howley's monograph will ever be superseded.

FRANK G. SPECK

## ASIA

*Grammaire de la langue khmère (cambodgien).* GEORGES MASPERO. Imprimerie nationale: Paris, 1915. Ouvrage publié sous le patronage de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient, VIII, 490 pp.

This excellent grammar of Khmer, the fruit of twenty years of labor among the people, by an official in the Civil Service of Indo-China, marks an important event not only for the philologist, but also commands the serious attention of the ethnologist. The Khmer, whom we style Cambodjians (from Sanskrit Kamboja, the official designation of the country in native documents), number at present about 1,700,000 individuals distributed over Cambodja and the adjoining territories of Cochin-China, Siam, and Laos. The tribal name is of ancient date, being preserved in the transcription Ki-mao in the Chinese annals of the T'ang dynasty (618-906), and being recorded as Comar by the Arabic travelers from the ninth century onward. In former epochs the area covered by the Khmer was far more extended, and comprised the lower basins of the Mekong (from Luang-Prabang) and the Menam (from the wall of Kamphëng-Phet). Khmer domination in the latter region up to the eleventh or twelfth century is attested by ancient inscriptions found in Siam. The entire country now designated Cochin-

China was exclusively Cambodian up to 1658 when it was overrun by the armies of the Annamese. The theory has been proposed that the Khmer should not be indigenous to their present habitats, but should be regarded as immigrants hailing from western regions, probably from India, while their present home, inclusive of Cochin-China, Annam, Champa, and the littoral of southern Indo-China, should have been the cradle of the ancestors of the Malayo-Polynesian stock, the Cham being its direct offspring, and the Malaysians their emigrant descendants. Maspero points out that this thesis is based on purely linguistic data, and that no historical fact has as yet come to the fore to corroborate it. Profound anthropological studies will be required before the discussion of this problem may assume a definite shape. For the time being we can set the Khmer in relation only with a certain number of tribes surrounding them, on the basis of linguistic evidence. These are the Pear and Cong on the right bank of the Mekong; the Kuoy and Suoy or Sue on both sides of this river; the Stieng, Pnong, Krol, Tiom-Pueun, Rmang, Brao, Bahnar, Sedang, Boloven, Kaseng, Alak, Ve, Kon-Tu, Ta Hoi, and Leung on the left bank of the Mekong. The ethnology of these primitive tribes, aside from some notes on the Pnong by Dr. Harmand, has not yet been studied. This group is enclosed in the north and west by peoples of the T'ai family (Siamese and Laos); in the south, north, and east by Annamese; and in the east, first, by peoples of Malayan speech, the Cham and some savage mountain tribes like the Raglai, Churu, Pih, Rade, and Jarai, second, by the important tribe of the Cho-Ma whose language seems to be intermediary between the Malayan and Khmer types of speech.

Further, Khmer and its dialectic variations form with Mon and a number of allied savage dialects a linguistic group which has received the name Mon-Khmer. The Mon on whom we bestow the designation Peguans, and whom the Burmese style Talaing were the inhabitants of the kingdom of Pegu that occupied the delta region of the Irawaddy, the north of the peninsula of Malakka, and probably part of the lower basin of the Menam, where it was contiguous to the Khmer kingdom. Conquered and subjected by the Burmese, the Mon since 1286 have ceased to form a distinct nation. The close relationship of their language to that of the Khmer is incontestably proved;<sup>1</sup> likewise to that of the Palaung, Wa, and Riang, primitive tribes in the basin of the Salwen.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. W. Schmidt, "Grundzüge einer Lautlehre der Mon-Khmer-Sprachen," *Denkschriften Wiener Akademie*, vol. LI (1905), pp. 1-233.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the appendix concerning these languages in P. W. Schmidt, "Grundzüge einer Lautlehre der Khasi-Sprache," *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie*, vol. XXII (1904), pp. 778-805.

An attempt has been made also to link Annamese and Cham into the same group with Mon-Khmer, and philologists like Fr. Müller, E. Kuhn, and P. W. Schmidt have heralded the existence of a Mon-Khmer-Annam family. The students who attended the general linguistic courses at Columbia University in 1906-07 will recall the interest then evoked by a discussion of P. W. Schmidt's theories.<sup>1</sup> It has been apparent for some time that these, partially at least, are not built on a sound foundation, and to some extent are in need of a revision. Among the propositions submitted by the writer to the Research Committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its last meeting was therefore included a recommendation that the program developed by P. W. Schmidt be made the guiding motive of a research worker in the field in question, chiefly as Schmidt's conclusions are partially based on limited and unsatisfactory material. In regard to Annamese, Henri Maspero,<sup>2</sup> a brother of Georges Maspero, has conclusively proved in a remarkable study that Annamese cannot be attached to the Mon-Khmer family. The alleged relationship was merely suggested by the coincidence of the numerals from six to nine.<sup>3</sup> Phonetically and grammatically, Annamese exhibits radical differences from Mon-Khmer. It does not share in the prefixes and infixes of this group, and moreover has developed a system of tones which in minute details agrees with that of the T'ai languages, whereas there is no trace of similar or any tones in Mon-Khmer. Whether Annamese for this reason should be classified in the T'ai family it is difficult to decide in our present state of knowledge. Modern Annamese presents an extremely complex structure, being the final product of a mixture of quite a number of different languages. Tied up between Khmer in the south, T'ai in the west, and Chinese in the north, it has been subject to an overwhelming influence from each of these groups. Primeval Annamese, with a foundation of its own, appears to have been evolved from the fusion of a Mon-Khmer

<sup>1</sup> "Die Mon-Khmer-Völker, ein Bindeglied zwischen Völkern Zentralasiens und Austronesiens," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, vol. v (1906), pp. 59-109.

<sup>2</sup> "Études sur la phonétique historique de la langue annamite," *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient*, vol. XII, no. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Hence E. Kuhn in his fundamental study, "Beiträge zur Sprachenkunde Hinterindiens" (*Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie*, 1889, p. 219), rightly inferred, "We are therefore justified in concluding that originally Annamese was foreign to the cycle of the other languages, and that its coincidences with these are traceable to subsequent influences,—a supposition which is well in keeping with historical conditions, as the Annamese appear to have started from the extreme northeast of the territory now inhabited by them."

and a T'ai dialect, even with the addition perhaps of a form of speech as yet unknown, and subsequently with the layer of an enormous mass of Chinese words. The dominating influence to which Annamese owes its modern characteristics is to be attributed to a T'ai language, and certain it is that Annamese is not Mon-Khmer.

In opposition to Schmidt, Cham and its congeners must likewise be detached from Mon-Khmer and assigned to the Malayan group; the Khmer elements in Cham are simply loans due to historical contact. I concur with G. Maspero in his scepticism as to the alleged relationships of Mon-Khmer on the one hand and Khasi, the Kolarian languages of Central India, Nicobar, Senoi and Semang on the other. The material at our disposal is still so incomplete and deficient that Schmidt's conclusions must still be regarded as somewhat premature, or at least be accepted with caution. I regret that G. Maspero has not pronounced an opinion on Schmidt's further theory of a connection of Mon-Khmer with Malayan (his so-called Austronesian group).

The earliest document of the Khmer language, known at present, is a twelve-line inscription yielding the date A.D. 629. Three hundred and fifty inscriptions and a large number of manuscripts written on palm leaves allow us to pursue the development of the language from the seventh century till the present. During this interval it has undergone no fundamental change, not even in its vocabulary; the noticeable modifications are all phonetic and of a normal character. In consequence of its monosyllabic formation, the language follows the tendency to reduce polysyllabic foreign words by contraction to a single syllable; for instance, *suor*, "heaven," from Sanskrit *svarga*; *pros*, "male," from Sanskrit *purusha*; *sas*, "religion," from Sanskrit *gāsana*.

The most interesting feature in the structure of Khmer is the formation of words by means of prefixes and infixes. In a former stage also suffixes seem to have been employed to a limited extent, but only few traces of these can be recognized (for instance, *leu*, "above," *leuñ*, "to mount"); the language has lost consciousness of them. Some examples of prefix formation are:

<i>leñ</i> , to play	— <i>p'-leñ</i> , orchestra.
<i>em</i> , sweet	— <i>pa-em</i> , sugared.
<i>cap</i> , to adhere	— <i>k'-cap</i> , adhering.
<i>san</i> , peace	— <i>k'-san</i> , peaceful.
<i>cuor</i> , furrow	— <i>p'-cuor</i> , to till the ground.
<i>ñap</i> , death	— <i>ro-ñap</i> , to be extinguished.
<i>sa</i> , unconstant	— <i>sañ-sa</i> , light-minded.

<i>tiet</i> , other	— <i>kan-tiet</i> , stranger.
<i>seum</i> , humid	— <i>an-seum</i> , dew.
<i>bauk</i> , hump of oxen	— <i>dam-bauk</i> , conical hill.
<i>heñ</i> , dry	— <i>kra-heñ</i> , cleft in dry earth.
<i>mat</i> , mouth	— <i>pra-mat</i> , to insult.
<i>mul</i> , together	— <i>sra-mul</i> , to join.
<i>he</i> , to follow in procession	— <i>dañ-he</i> , to accompany the king.

Infixes are derived in the following manner:

<i>kruþ</i> , enough	— <i>k-om-rup</i> , to be sufficient.
<i>kan</i> , to hold	— <i>k'-m-an</i> , one who holds.
<i>cam</i> , to guard	— <i>c-m-an</i> , guardian.
<i>deu</i> , to march	— <i>t'-m-eu</i> , traveller.
<i>ar</i> , to saw	— <i>a-na-r</i> , a saw.
<i>kal</i> , to support	— <i>k'-n-al</i> , a support.
<i>khe</i> , month	— <i>k-añ-he</i> , season.
<i>kem</i> , varied	— <i>k'-l-em</i> , mixed.
<i>tiñ</i> , balance	— <i>t'-l-iñ</i> , to weigh — <i>t-aml-iñ</i> , weight.
<i>pëk</i> , division	— <i>p-ñ-ëk</i> , portion, <i>p-amp-ëk</i> , to divide, <i>p-amn-ëk</i> , piece, <i>p-rap-ëk</i> , division.
<i>k'vak</i> , blindness	— <i>k-añ-vak</i> , blind.
<i>k'lañ</i> , strong	— <i>k-am-lañ</i> , strength, force.
<i>k'cil</i> , lazy	— <i>k-am-cil</i> , laziness.
<i>krol</i> , to roll from above downward	— <i>ke-d-rol</i> , cascade.
<i>brañ</i> , black	— <i>be-d-rañ</i> , soot.
<i>pran</i> , to bait	— <i>pe-d-ran</i> , bait.
<i>kañ</i> , circle	— <i>k'-v-añ</i> , curved.
<i>dal</i> , to husk rice	— <i>t-b-al</i> , mortar for husking rice.
<i>cik</i> , to dig	— <i>c-ran-ik</i> , hoe.

In respect to social customs and conventions, the excessive use of appellative nouns in the place of personal pronouns is of great interest. Their judicious employment is a veritable crux of the language and must be observed with rigorous attention. Maspero enumerates no less than forty-four forms of address varying according to sex, age, title, or function of the speaker or the person accosted. In addressing children different words are used for boys and girls, for babies, infants, small boys and girls, boys and girls in the stage of puberty, while the children have different pronominal expressions in speaking to father and mother. Functionaries, dignitaries, bonzes, kings, slaves, women have all distinct forms of address.

From a consideration of the numerals it may be inferred that Khmer has run through a threefold stage of development,—a quaternary,

quinary, and vigesimal. Primarily the Khmer counted only up to four, for solely the numbers from one to four are common to all the members of the family. After their separation the Khmer proceeded to form a word for five, a monosyllable incapable of analysis. By means of the quinary system thus attained they succeeded in counting up to nine by the process of addition: five one, five two, five three, five four. In creating an unanalyzable root-word for ten they completed a decimal system which is logically carried out in the numbers from 11 to 19, framed after the scheme  $1 + 10$ ,  $2 + 10$ , etc. Finally a monosyllabic expression for twenty, neither related to five nor to ten, was called into existence, and this represents their highest unit. Hence it should be supposed that all higher decimal units were based on twenty, but whether this was the case or not escapes our knowledge, as from the end of the thirteenth century the Khmer adopted the Siamese numerals from thirty upward. All other languages of the group (Mon, Stieng, Bahnar, Sedang, and Boloven) have common forms for the numerals from six to nine (but different from those of Khmer), and have evolved a decimal system. Like many other languages, Khmer, too, abounds in numeratives styled by Maspero *déterminatifs spécifiques*.

The verb is little developed, and does not offer much of general interest. A useful list of principal roots and their most common derivatives concludes the volume. The typographical work is perfect, and the new font of Khmer type designed, engraved, and cast by the Imprimerie Nationale, is very creditable. G. Maspero is also the author of a history of Champa (*Le royaume de Champa*, Leiden, 1914) and of an excellent history of the Khmer (*L'Empire khmèr, histoire et documents*, Phnom-Penh, 1904).

B. LAUFER

#### AFRICA

*Anthropological Report on Sierra Leone. Part i. Law and Custom of the Timne and Other Tribes. Part ii. Timne-English Dictionary. Part iii. Timne Grammar and Stories.* NORTHCOTE W. THOMAS. Harrison and Sons: London, 1916. III vols., 8°, pp. 196, viii, 139, xxx, 86.

*Specimens of Languages from Sierra Leone.* NORTHCOTE W. THOMAS. Harrison and Sons: London, 1916. Large 8°, pp. 62.

These reports by Northcote W. Thomas, government anthropologist, are in form and character like his earlier reports on Nigerian peoples. Sierra Leone, with an area of about thirty-one thousand square miles has a native population of about one and a quarter million. The tribes